

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 9, 13, 14, 17-22, 25, 28-30 and 35-40 are pending. Claims 1, 9, 17 and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

In the August 7, 2008 Final Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-6, 9, 13, 14, 17-22, 25, 28-30, and 35-40. Claims 1-6, 9, 13-14, and 35-40 and 14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. in view of Cherry et al. (US 2003/0151762). Claims 17, 18, 25, 28, and 30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. in view of Cherry et al. and further in view of Reilly (US 6,502,147).

The Examiner rejected claim 19 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. in view of Cherry et al. in view of Reilly, and further in view of Leone, III et al. (US 2003/0002081). Claims 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. in view of Cherry et al. in view of Reilly, and further in view of Yoneda et al. (US 6,564,337). Claims 22 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hower, Jr. et al. in view of Cherry et al. in view of Reilly, and further in view of Lee (US 2003/0226139). The Applicants respectfully request reexamination of the presently pending claims.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method of determining final media selection parameters, comprising:
receiving, at a printer, a print job including a print client indicator, the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters;
comparing the print client indicator to a plurality of entries in a mapping module;
determining if a matching entry including the print client indicator exists in the mapping module;
determining if the matching entry includes media selection parameters; and
outputting at least one of the media selection parameters as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry exists in the mapping module.

The Hower reference does not disclose, teach or suggest the method of claim 1, as amended. The Examiner stated that "Hower, Jr. '434 does not explicitly show receiving, at a printer, a print job including a print client indicator, the print client indicator being existing information in the communication mechanism being utilized to send the print [job] from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters." (*Final Office Action p. 5*). The Applicant agrees.

The Examiner cited Cherry '762 in order to overcome the deficiencies of Hower. More specifically, the Examiner attempted to correlate the Print Agent 112 of Cherry with a "***print client indicator***" that is included in a print job, and the specially designed Authorization Code 400 of Cherry with "***existing information in the communication mechanism.***" The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Cherry does not disclose, teach or suggest the method of amended independent claim 1. The Print Agent 112 of Cherry is not part of the print job at all, but rather is responsible for adding information to the print job (i.e. the Authorization Code 400), and then routing the print job to the appropriate destination. The Print Agent 112 of Cherry is also responsible for allowing access to the Communications Link 104 (Page 2, paragraph [0018]). Since it is not part of the print job, it therefore cannot be a "print client indicator" as described in amended independent claim 1.

Furthermore, the Print Agent 112 of Cherry is actually adding information to the print job in the form of a specially designed Authorization Code 400 (Page 3, paragraph [0032]) that is used by the recipient of the print job (monitoring device/server 102, 202) to validate the request. The Authorization Code 400 of Cherry is specifically added to

the existing print job, as created by the print client, for the express purpose of providing the information necessary to validate the print job. Thus, this is not "**existing information** in the communication mechanism being utilized to send the print job from a print client," but is instead additional information added for the express purpose of doing validation.

Consequently, Cherry does not disclose, teach or suggest the method of "**receiving, at a printer, a print job including a print client indicator, the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.**" Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1, as amended, distinguishes over the Cherry and Hower combination.

Independent claim 9, as amended, recites limitations similar to claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 9 distinguishes over the Cherry and Hower combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, as amended.

Independent claim 35 recites limitations similar to claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 35 distinguishes over the Cherry and Hower combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 1, as amended.

Claims 2-6, 13-14 and 36-40 depend, indirectly or directly, on claims 1, 9 and 35, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-6, 13-14 and 36-40 distinguish over the Cherry and Hower combination for the same reasons as those

discussed above in regard to claim 1.

Independent claim 17, as amended, recites:

A multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job, comprising:

a decoding module to receive the submitted print job and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job, ***the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the submitted print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters;***

a mapping module including a plurality of entries, each of the plurality of entries including at least one print client indicator and a corresponding media selection parameter; and

a parameter determination module to receive the at least one print client indicator from the decoding module, to compare the at least one print client indicator to the plurality of entries in the mapping module to determine if a matching entry corresponds to the at least one print client indicator, and to output at least one media selection parameter as one of the final media selection parameters if the matching entry is found in the mapping table.

Independent claim 17, as amended, recites limitation similar to claim 1, as amended. Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that claim 17, as amended, distinguishes over the Cherry reference for reasons similar to those mentioned above in regard to claim 1, as amended.

The Reilly and Hower references do not make up for the deficiencies of the Cherry reference. The Examiner utilizes the Reilly reference to disclose that a multi-media printer renders an image from a submitted print job (i.e., print servers and a printer may be combined in the same machine on many networks for economical reasons). (*Final Office Action, page 15*). Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Reilly reference discloses all that the Examiner states that it does, the Reilly reference does not disclose a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job including a decoding module to receive the submitted print job and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job, ***the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the submitted print job from a***

print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 17, as amended, distinguishes over the Cherry, Hower, and Reilly references.

Claim 17, as amended, also distinguishes over the Leone, Yoneda and Lee references. The Examiner utilizes the Leone reference to disclose a printer having a mapping module stored on a removable memory, i.e., a data template stored in the printing apparatus to provide a structure for specifying the printed format of the data transmitted from the portable memory device. (*Final Office Action, page 21*). The Examiner utilizes the Yoneda reference to disclose that a mapping module is updated via an operational panel of the multi-media printer, i.e., the operation control panel 21 of printer 20 updates the IP address that is stored in the port setting information 22. (*Final Office Action, page 22*). The Examiner utilizes the Lee reference to disclose the updating of the mapping module by the transmission of a command from a print client (i.e., the client computer then signals the network printer to cause installation of the software update on the network printer). (*Final Office Action, page 24*).

Assuming, *arguendo*, that the Leone, Yoneda and Lee references disclose all that the Examiner states that they do, none of the references disclose a multi-media printer to render an image from a submitted print job including a decoding module to receive the submitted print job and to extract at least one print client indicator from the submitted print job, **the print client indicator being existing information in the communication protocol being utilized to send the submitted print job from a print client, wherein the existing information is typically not used to determine media selection parameters.** Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim

17, as amended, distinguishes over the Cherry / Leone / Yoneda / Lee / Hower / Reilly combination.

Claim 28, as amended, recites limitation similar to claim 17, as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 distinguishes over the Cherry, Hower, and Reilly combination for reasons similar to those discussed above in regard to claim 17.

Claims 18-22 and 29-30 depend, indirectly or directly, on claims 17 and 28, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 18-22 and 29-30 distinguishes over the Cherry / Hower / Reilly / Leone / Yoneda / Lee combination for the same reasons as those discussed above in regard to claims 17.

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

///

Applicants believe that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, and a favorable action is respectfully requested. If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles telephone number (213) 488-7100 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance should the Examiner believe that such a telephone conference would advance prosecution of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

Date: February 9, 2009

By: 
Carolyn Lu
Registration No. 56,817
Attorney for Applicant(s)

725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406
Telephone: (213) 488-7100
Facsimile: (213) 629-1033